



Do not allow yourself to be misled by any such manifestations as that of the recent Rail-Road Convention in Washington city. A meeting of equal numbers of mechanics, farmers, or day laborers taken at random, would be ten times more likely to represent the real sentiment of the masses of the people than any assembly of interested capitalists, the representatives of soulless corporations, not of human beings with souls, and consciences, and hearts.

There is another thing that you and other Northern Senators and Representatives ought to know, just at this juncture. The monetary panic in this city and throughout the North is rapidly passing away. As a panic, especially as a political excitement, it has almost or quite ceased. Well-informed and experienced merchants in this city, had expected a money pressure, this Winter, six months before it took place, from causes totally disconnected with political affairs.

The political excitement, it is now thought, precipitated and intensified it, and for that very reason, was instrumental, by its natural reaction, in bringing it to an earlier close. Business is on the whole quite as good as usual, for this season of the year. There is less complaint of destitution, less vagrancy, less street and street-corner begging than for several winters past.

Attention has been turned to the extent and general results of Southern trade. The *N. Y. Times* has made an estimate that the aggregate of Southern trade to this city cannot exceed seven and a half per cent of its trade from the whole country; that the trade from Massachusetts is more in amount than from all the slave States; and that the trade of two inland counties of this State to this city, is more than from some entire Southern States. Still further, it is calculated by the *Times*, that the Southern trade to this city, on the whole, is a losing business to those here engaged in it, though some few have acquired wealth by it. The long credits given, and the uncertainty of remittances returned, sufficiently accounts for this, and has long been known to experienced and prudent merchants. So that the city as a whole, would be better off without its Southern trade, than with it.

Add to this, the unexpected fact that the Southern secession has already begun to drive the trade of the Mississippi valley from New Orleans to New York city, increasing greatly its business in that direction, and promising, if the secession continues, to double its commerce, in consequence. Even the *New York Herald* is giving circulation to these facts, the same paper that so recently predicted the ruin of New York, and of the whole North, unless the slave States could be conciliated by a compliance with their insolent demands!

This recently changed state of things, as you may readily conceive, is beginning to work as great and as rapid a revolution of sentiment in this city—so far as the idea of the pecuniary necessity of concessions to the slave States is concerned—as in any part of the country. New York merchants and capitalists are, for the first time, opening their eyes to the real facts of the case. Were it otherwise, the people of the interior have learned, long ago, that a large class of New York merchants, bankers, and capitalists know less of the conditions of their own pecuniary prosperity, than do the farmers, the mechanics, or even the city cartmen in their employ. Witness their dogged opposition to the Erie Canal and the New York and Erie railroad. Witness also their opposition to the abolition of Southern slavery, a measure which would doubtless quadruple the commerce of the slave States with New York, in less than ten years, and place it, for the first time, on a safe basis.

At such a time, Mr. Seward, is it not a pitiful business for a New York Senator, of the broad scope of intelligence possessed by yourself, to be urging on the people of New York and the whole North, the absolute, the paramount, the inexorable necessity of giving up "Republicanism and every other political name and thing," liberty and right included, at the demand of the slaveholders, in order to preserve our Union with the slave States, and all this on the ground that pecuniary prosperity cannot be otherwise secured?

Do you think the people of the North will, on these grounds, and for such equivalents, harter away their birth-right of freedom, pollute their souls, and debase themselves in the eyes of the civilized world?

What if it should prove that the people of the North and Northwest, (under the teachings of the "fanatics" who have already broken down two great political parties and are now about ready to break down a third, if they find occasion) are in process of finding out that the Creator and controller of the universe is neither dead nor sleeping—that under His superintending Providence the only true wisdom is to DO RIGHT, and leave the consequences with HIM—that *godliness*—the doing of the right because it is right—is profitable unto all things, even in politics, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come?

Will not grave Statesmen, Senators and Representatives, Presidents and Secretaries of State, in the light of recent and passing events, learn these elementary truths before long? Yours for the truth,  
WILLIAM GODDELL.  
339 Pearl Street, New York, Feb. 2, 1861.

LETTERS TO THE CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION, AT NEW-YORK, JAN. 32

From Rev. David Thurston, D. D.

LITCHFIELD CORNER, ME., JAN. 18, 1861

REV. HENRY T. CURETTER,

My dear Sir:—Your notice of the "proposed Congregation of the Christian Friends of the Church Anti-Slavery Society" has been received. Were my circumstances such as to render it at all practicable for me to attend, most cheerfully would I be present. But the indications of God's providence are that I must not be there. My heart will be in the meeting, and my prayer to the Father of lights shall be that the discussions may all be conducted under the power of that "wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable," &c. Much of that wisdom is needed in discussing and treating this exciting, vexatious subject.

It is about thirty years since I became a good deal interested in the Anti-Slavery cause. Twenty seven years ago last autumn I preached three sermons on the subject. I first told my people what slavery was. Secondly, showing that it was inherently sinful, a forbidden relation. Being a believer in the duty of immediate repentance for sin, I stated that slaveholding ought immediately to cease. I have read considerable on the subject, *pro* and *con*, since; and have examined the Scriptures on the subject. The result has been the strengthening of my conviction, that the benevolent God ever authorized or approved of one class of men, in holding another class of men, as *property*. Look at the estimation in which Jehovah holds the distinction he has established between persons and things. "If a man steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep." Exo. 22, 1. "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Exo. 21, 16. Slaves are stolen property. This is undeniable.

A man's right to himself lies at the foundation of all his other rights. Take that away and what has he left? Not anything, certainly. He is a mere marketable commodity.

From the Declaration of Independence, which was unanimous in thirteen United States, we learn that they held certain truths to be self-evident. Among these were "the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men." Then, in the preamble to the Constitution, it is said, "We, the people of the U. S.,—to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility,—and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution." To say that there is any article in the Constitution contravening or inconsistent with these principles, is virtually to charge the men who formed the Constitution, and the people who adopted it, with being either numskulls, or knaves. But they were neither. They did not incorporate into that instrument anything contrary to their declared object in forming and adopting it. There is no avoiding this dilemma.

The men, who attempt to prove from the Bible that slaveholding is right, that it has a divine sanction, must believe, either that negroes are not men, or that God has doomed men to death for what he sanctions. God did sentence men-stealers to death. Not once merely, as in the passage already cited, but forty years after he said, "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and making merchandise of him, then that thief shall die." Deut. 24, 7. Accordingly we find men-stealers

placed by the apostle, (1 Tim. 1, 9, 10) among "murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers." God has never authorized men to do that for doing which He has doomed them to death. There must therefore be some great fallacy in that way of interpreting scripture which arrays God against himself. Certainly those who interpret scripture as authorizing slavery do this.

Every slaveholder is either a man-stealer, or a receiver of what somebody else has stolen. Those brought from Africa were stolen. Every child born of a slave mother is stolen. For such children have the same natural, inherent right to freedom, as have the children born of free mothers. "God is no respecter of persons." There is no authority, natural or scriptural, for such a distinction between slave mothers and free mothers. "Let God be true, though every man be a liar."

Men have a right to property, gained by lawful labor; slaves have not this right; therefore slaves are not men. Human beings have a right to freedom; slaves have no right to freedom, therefore slaves are not human beings.

It is this interpreting the Bible in favor of slavery, which has led some anti-slavery men to reject the Bible, as "given by inspiration of God." Nor is it any matter of surprise. Such expounders of scripture are supposed to understand its true meaning. The essential principle of slavery is so perfectly antagonistic to the principles of humanity and benevolence, that they cannot admit the Bible to be from God. Much of the infidelity among abolitionists is chargeable upon those ministers and others who have taught that the Bible authorizes slaveholding.

Men may, by their wickedness, forfeit their right to freedom and even to life. But they cannot forfeit their right to be men, human, accountable beings, nor to be dealt with as such.

The present is a time in which much needs to be done for the peaceful abolition of slavery. Much, earnest, believing, persevering prayer should be offered to God, that He will turn men from their errors on this subject and lead them to give the sustained right. These prayers should be accompanied with unwearied efforts in the domestic circle, in meetings for conference and prayer, in the pulpit and by the press, to diffuse a correct interpretation of the teachings of the Bible relating to slavery. The churches must not only lay down strong resolutions against this sin, but treat slaveholding as a sin of great magnitude. Many churches have passed very good resolutions on the subject, and then nullified their force by treating slaveholders, as though not guilty of any immorality. They have sent and received Christian salutations to and from bodies in which slaveholding was practiced. No wonder that so little regard has been paid to these resolutions. "Practice speaks louder than words." Slavery is a monster evil. Its name is Legion. God placed man a little lower than the angels. Did He place him right? But where does slavery place him? Ah, where! With the beasts that perish? Lower still, with inanimate matter! In profane disregard of God, slavery annihilates that fundamental distinction, which He established between persons and things.

Let us then gird up our loins anew, with the truths of God, and wield this sword of the Spirit, manfully. Jehovah is on the side of right. Surely then we shall prevail.

Fraternally yours,  
DAVID THURSTON.

P. S. I enclose one dollar and would have been able to enclose \$100, for the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

If Mr. Sloane gives a good review of Mr. VanDyke's sermon, I hope it will be published and widely circulated. I have read Mr. VanDyke. But what perversion of scripture!

From Rev. J. C. Webster,;

To the President of a Convention of the Christian friends of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, to be held on Wednesday the 23rd inst, at the "Church of the Puritans."

DEAR SIR:—I have only just learned of the arrangement for your meeting. And I only regret that protracted sickness in my family, if there were no other reason, would prevent my attendance. I should love to unite in your deliberations and prayers.

You will assemble at a most momentous juncture, if affairs in the history of our nation, and of the "irrepressible conflict" between liberty and slavery. A black and white

aining clouds lies all along our southern horizon. We hear of its direful thunders, and we see of its lightning flashes. But how extensively and incessantly the storm may rage is best known to Him, who has the elements of man's passion entirely at his control. It is sad, indeed, to think of the bare possibility of a civil and fratricidal war. And, so far as we have been acquainted, the most ardent friends and advocates of the abolition of slavery have been prominently the friends and advocates of peace. But the "Prince of peace" himself has said, "It must needs be that offences come, but we do that man by whom the offence cometh," and again, "think not that I am come to send peace in earth. I come not to send peace, but a sword! And it must needs be, while the human heart resists the progress of divine truth.

But I cannot understand that even such consequences furnish a sufficient reason why Christians and the Christian Churches of our land should relax, at all their moral and ecclesiastical efforts to undo the heavy burdens, and to oppress our country. Though it may be too late now to save our country from a deluge of blood, it is possible by sufficient efforts to mitigate its horrors, and to secure a successful overthrow of slavery, and the permanent establishment of civil and religious freedom. If the Church of our country had not been neglectful of its duty to the oppressed by recognizing slaveholding as compatible with Christian morality, our government had not been brought to its present verge of ruin. And if it is saved, it seems as though it can be only by the prayers and consistent labors of the truly faithful, who are willing to lose their lives, if need be, in the conflict.

The circumstances under which you meet are as conspicuous as they are momentous. The public attention was never so thoroughly aroused to the subject of slavery. And Christians and Christian ministers are coming to consider more than ever, a moral and religious rather than, or as well as, a mere political subject. And the question whether slaveholding is right or wrong in itself, must be settled.

I hope the Divine Spirit will be with you, and guide you in all your deliberations. May fervent prayer be offered to this end. And while you are as harmless as doves and wise as serpents, may you be as bold as lions in the expression and defence of truth. In this way, and to the end that the cause of the poor slave may be promoted, and that of his powerful oppressor may be hastened, I hope that your convention will continue much towards calling the attention of all Christians to the claims of the "Church Anti-slavery Society," and to show that though it be only a "donkey engine," "its peculiarities" is not that it derives motive power from any main engine of larger pretensions, but that it has its own independent connection with the really effective source of influence, and the important office of spurring up machines of greater magnitude, and so more sluggish in their operation, to more faithful discharge of their duty. At any rate, if God be for us and with us, we need not fear what man may say and do unto us. It was but a stripling who completed successfully with Philistin's boastful omphalos, though clad in a coat of mail, and that too with the insignificant means of a shepherd's staff, because God was with him and directed his aim. My grace, mercy and peace be with you all.

Truly yours,

Hopkinton, Mass. Jan. 20, 1861 J. C. WEBSTER

From Rev. Justin D. Fuller.

ALBANY, Jan. 14th, 1861

REV. HENRY F. CHERRY,

My Dear Brother,—It would afford me pleasure to meet the honest and stalwart friends of humanity at the time specified in your letter. My views relative to the cause best to be pursued are these:

First,—to "speak in truth" on the B'bi platform.—Insist that American slavery be treated as sinful to the Bible doctrine; viz.

1st. That converts to Christianity who sell free. Since we are years.

2. That the year of jubilee be proclaimed in fifty years.

In other words, promise the 25th of Lewisian as an amendment to the Constitution, and then take the 4th of Jeremiah as the law pronounced by God, "less they forget the condition as prescribed by God.

of God, proclaim a liberty to the negro, in the nation, and in the settlement.

In regard to our present embarrasment, I believe the Union should be preserved, without war, if possible, while necessary.

If war comes, let us offer freedom to the captive, proclaim liberty to all who shall join the advancing columns, pushing on to the subjugation of tyrants, and the overthrow of the worst despotism now existing in this Western Hemisphere.

The Morning Star of freedom has risen. The sun will follow. Let us go forward resolutely prayerfully, and righteously, remembering "That duty ours, while consequences hang in doubt."

Hoping and praying that God may these every course calculated to widen the area of freedom, and exalt the interests of men. I remain, as ever, yours in the best of bonds.

JESTIN D. FULLER.

Who do not suppose the strict scrutiny proposed to incorporate the Moral law of the Union into our Federal Constitution. He takes the slaveholders and their defenders on their own ground and shows their hypocrisy in claiming slavery under a system they would not adopt, but which they attempt to carry into execution. The proposition, in this view, is a fair and pertinent one. The irony is real. Boston.

#### NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

No. 27.

Now is the time for the Government of the United States, to show whether its sovereignty is a reality or a fiction. It is said that the State of South Carolina has seceded from the Union. She has done no such thing. The State in the true sense, has not acted in the premises. What is the State? It is a people organized into a government, to maintain law and right. But the secession is a lawless movement for lawless ends. The true purposes of government are not aimed at, by it. Moreover, it is not a free set of the people. Not half of them have even a nominal liberty to act. The portion actually free are under a reign of terror. A few master spirits control the whole movement, not in behalf of the people, and for their good, but for their own despotic ends. But even if a majority of the people freely concurred in the movement, it would still be against the peace and dignity of the State. It makes no difference with the character and validity of the movement whether the actors number nine-tenths of the population or only one-tenth. To be an authorized State measure it must be in behalf of all the people, and for their benefit. But if the State does not act, in her true capacity, who are the actors? They are certain persons who are citizens of the United States, and at the same time citizens of South Carolina. What are they doing? They are attempting to wrest a State from the Union for purposes opposed to the rights and welfare of both States. Why is this done? It is an act of double treason. Why is it done for double reason? Because it is both against the Union and against the State of South Carolina. What is the duty of the General Government? It is to protect South Carolina against treason, and maintain its own sovereignty. How does this appear? Suppose a foreign power had wrested South Carolina from the Union for the very same purposes which the seceders have in view. Would anybody question the obligation of the National Government to recover that State, and restore the people to the privileges of the Union? And is the obligation less imperative when the breach is made by treason and not by foreign aggression? Certainly not. But it may be said, if the people choose to go out of the Union, the case is different from their being forced out by a foreign power. True, if they are unanimous in the choice. In such a case, the only question would be whether the National Government should tolerate treason against itself. But if any of the people, however few, remain loyal to the Union and desire to remain in it, they have a claim upon the Government to be protected in the enjoyment of their dearest rights. It would be faithless in the Government to abandon them. But say as they say, if the National Government puts down secession by force, blood will flow. Recently will if traitors who stand in habitual fear of unarmed slaves, be the ruling power as the minister God, must not bear the sword in vain. Who will confide in a government that omits treason? Should the slaves of South Carolina,

who were majority of the people, find means to get the Government of the State out of the hands of their oppressors, and attempt to maintain a government of the Union, in a Constitutional manner, how many voices would be raised, regarding it as a crime, for an interpolation of Federal power to put them down. The slave interests are never springing of blood, control not for itself. After all what labors, South Carolina, or twenty South Carolina, could do, would have to contend in vain with the Federal Government, if that Government showed a determined purpose to put down rebellion? If it does it, the will do it for the sake of the slave interest. But how long is it that that interest in the aid of that Federal Government against an invasion of twenty men?

WAY-MARKS IN THE MORAL WAR WITH SLAVERY.

BY REV. HENRY F. CHERRY.

NO. XXI.

Non-communication with slaveholders in Scotland.

We learn that the vital principle adopted by the Christian Anti-slavery Society, and practically enforced by certain small bodies of Christians in this country, of refusing fellowship and communion to slaveholders, is reaffirmed in the old country, in such a way that it will tell powerfully upon the slave system.

Recently, in Aberdeen, Scotland, a family from Louisiana presented themselves for communion in an Episcopal Church, when it occurred to the minister to inquire if this man was a slaveholder, and finding that he was, he said to him "Well sir, if that be the case, you cannot be received to christian communion in this church." The slaveholder had therefore to depart, with that rebuke of his sin, as justly excluding him from the communion of the saints.

What will the Independent say to such fanaticism? In Scotland, a practical case of what has been declared to be "the almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline." Such cases will multiply, as the eyes of Christendom get open to the hideous enormity of the crime of holding property in man. But Rev. Mr. Van Dyke goes unrebuked as yet, by his co-prebys, for teaching in the old school Presbyterian pulpit of Brooklyn, that, "to assert that the idea of property in man is an enormity and a crime blasphemes the name of God and His doctrine." And Rev. Dr. Palmer of New Haven, without losing case or credit in the ministry, publishes a tract to the youth of our country, even at the laymen's point, because the North will not agree to its being, what he calls "the sacred presidential trust committed by Almighty God to the South, to preserve and transmit our existing system of domestic servitude, with the right, unchanged by man, to go and root it out wherever Providence and nature may carry it."

What will christians in England and Scotland say to such monstrous perversion and apostasy in the American Pulpit? Are we mistaken in expecting such a blast of holy indignation and rebuke from the old world, as has never blown upon the new, before? H. T. C.

The case of non-communication related above, is no new thing in Scotland or in England. What the Independent will think of it, we cannot say. But we remember how indignant Mr. X. J. Sawyer was, upwards of 25 years ago, when it was asserted that British churches, generally, declined communion with slaveholders.—Errors.

The Fugitive Slave Case at Toronto.—A bill of attainder corpus issued.—In the Court of Queen's Bench, Westminster, on the 15th, Mr. Edwin James appeared for a writ of habeas corpus to bring up Anderson who was charged as a slave in America, in order that he might be discharged. The affidavit on which the movement was made was sworn to by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto, but is now imprisoned under no legal warrant or authority whatever, detained and unceremoniously held in slavery by Mr. Chalmers, a Scotchman, and by Mr. Brown and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and declared that Anderson is a British subject, and was domiciled in Toronto

# The Principia.

NEW YORK SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1861.

## THE ALTERNATIVE

A writer in the *Congressional Herald*, Chicago, has the following:

"In the present attitude of freedom and slavery, one of the following measures must be adopted. 1. A peaceful separation, or, 2. War, or, 3. Compromise. I mention them in the order of bad, worse, worst."

We beg leave to suggest a fourth alternative, which, instead of being either "bad, worse, or worst," is good, better, and best, being the express command of infinite goodness and wisdom, namely, a national proclamation of "liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." This would take away all occasion for either separation, war, or compromise.

The petty oligarchy that now overrules the nation, would be overruled itself, and submit peacefully, begging for the protection of the Union, instead of separation from it, aiming for peace, instead of either proclaiming war, or demanding compromise.

How long will it be before those who think they believe in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and who would be shocked at the proposal to exchange their guidance for that of human reason, will submit to be guided by their most explicit and authoritative commands, instead of following the will-o'-the-wisp light of their own worldly wisdom and human reason?

The Bible "alternative," clear as the noon-day sun, is NATIONAL ABOLITION or NATIONAL DISORGANIZATION. Who can help reading it now, in the public journals, as well as in the Bible.

And besides, anything short of National Abolition IS "compromise," giving up one-half of the nation to the arch fiend of slavery, when God commands us to proclaim liberty throughout ALL the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof; Giving up one half the nation to Satan, to purchase his gracious permission to retain freedom in the other half! We have heard of "infidel abolition," but is this *Bible* abolition?

## GERRIT SMITH IN CANADA

Gerrit Smith has been doing a good work in Canada. We have just been reading, in the Toronto *Globe*, tri-weekly, of January 21, his noble speech at Toronto, Jan. 15, in behalf of the fugitive slave Anderson, whose rendition is claimed by our Government, on a charge of murder, for killing Seuca Digges, one of his pursuers. A court in Canada, had decided to give Anderson up to the American authorities, but from this decision there was appeal. Hence the occasion for the speech, which occupies nearly six long columns folio, in the *Globe*. It is one of the happiest efforts of Mr. Smith, and must have produced a deep and salutary effect. His thorough acquaintance with British and American law was brought to bear effectively upon the case. His allusions to pertinent facts in British and American history, and his ready and apposite quotations from prominent men in both hemispheres, his familiarity with the Ashburton treaty, and his personal conversation in respect to it, with Lord Ashburton himself, gave him advantages which were well improved. It was perfectly in place, also, for Mr. Smith to examine, as he did, the hearing of our Federal Constitution on the case, and to disavow his hearers of the impression that it contains compromises and stipulations in favor of slavery and requires the rendition of fugitive slaves. More than all in weight and power, were his appeals to the paramount authority of the Divine law, and the irreparable obligation of moral right.

Among his citations was one from Gov. Seward, who in declining to comply with a requisition of the Governor of Virginia, for the rendition of three men who had abducted a slave from Virginia, said,

"I remain of opinion that a being possessed of the physical, moral, and intellectual faculties common to the human race, cannot, by the force of any Constitution or laws, be goods or chattels, or a thing."

Discussions on Civil Government at the 11th Congregational Church, corner of South Third and Eleventh Streets. Question for next Thursday evening, Feb. 5.—What shall we do?

## SLAVERY AND SUGAR

The *N. Y. Tribune* states, that although the export of sugar from Jamaica before emancipation was 200,000 tons per annum and is now reduced to 45,000 tons, yet that all the English sugar islands together, exported about three times as much as in the best year of Slavery, besides consuming as much as they wanted. From some cause, it is certain that W. I. sugars are cheaper and of far better quality than in the times of slavery. The great cry of the slavery party, before emancipation, used to be, that if slavery were abolished we should have to pay an exorbitant price for sugar and be unable to get an adequate supply, at any rate.

Just so they now talk about cotton, as though nothing could be produced, if the cultivators were honestly paid for their labor!

THE *TRIBUNE* is continually harping upon its new plan of conciliating the border slave States by proposing to compensate them for their slaves, and make them free States. It might as well speak of selling the laborer. It will meet no favor from the slaveholders. And besides, if the border States are to be compensated, the seceding State will expect the same, if they come back into the Union, and abolish slavery—which the *Tribune* omits, in its estimate.

## "BATHUR GREEN"

Our neighbor of the *N. Y. Times* is just rubbing open his eyes—

"It looks very much as if these compromises were enacted as the condition of Mr. Lincoln's coming into power at all. The idea pervades the whole compromise pressure, that unless concessions are made which shall satisfy the South before the 4th of March, the new Administration will not be permitted to assume the reins of Government. This really seems to be the issue tendered to the Republican Party—either to abandon what were regarded as its characteristic and essential principles,—or to be excluded from the Government, which the people have intrusted to their hands."

Who has supposed that the demand—or that the proposed measures of "pacification" to meet the demand, were for any purpose not including the settlement of this question? Who that has read Seward's Speech, and especially Sherman's, can fail to understand them as addressing themselves to that question?

## News of the Day.

### DISGRACEFUL SYMPATHY AND ATROCIOUS RAS- CALTY

The following stands in the *N. Y. Tribune* without note or comment. The *Tribune* is crying out against Republican compromises. Has it nothing to say against proceedings like these?

"If this is a foretaste of Republican rule, may God, in his mercy, deliver us from it, in some way, even if it be by a proslavery capture of the Capitol, and the breaking up of the Government. If Republicans can tolerate this, the inquiry of the nation is full."

### Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune.

#### FUGITIVE SLAVE CASE.

CLINTON, N. Y., Jan. 24, 1861.  
The agent who was sent to Virginia to collect testimony on behalf of the fugitive having returned, the consideration of the case was resumed yesterday at 2 p. m. by Commissioner White, who is a very large audience.  
John Goshorn, the father of the claimant, testified that he purchased Lucy about ten years since, in Richmond, and that she remained his slave until four years ago, when he gave her to his son, from whose house she escaped in October last.

Two officers testified that Lucy stated to them that the reason she ran away was because she had heard that her master was going to sell her South.

This closed the claimant's evidence. The testimony taken by the agent of the fugitive in Virginia, being the depositions of two of the daughters of the claimant, was then read, which, instead of showing that the woman had been taken voluntarily into a Free State, showed that her story was entirely untrue.

Thereupon Judge Spaulding in a few remarks admitted that she was a slave under the laws of Virginia, her escape therefrom, and that by the provisions of the Fugitive Slave act she must be returned, and *peaceably* returned. Mr. Barlow, counsel for the claimant, followed in a short speech, stating that one great object in claiming this fugitive had been to see if the people of Northern Ohio would execute the law, and he was gratified in being able to say that the citizens of Cleveland had come up to their duty usually, and had placed no impediments in the way of its faithful execution, and in behalf of the claimant he thanked them.

Thereupon the Commissioner made an order, withdrawing the fugitive, and ordering the Marshal to his assistance to deliver her to her master in Virginia.

The Commissioner having retired from the bench, Mr. Sedgwick, seated at the foot of the bench, stood up, and said he had not language to express his gratification for the manner in which he had been treated by the citizens of Cleveland. His mission, urged upon him by the Union-loving citizens of Cleveland, was in many respects an unusual one, but he hoped the result would be like oil poured upon the troubled waters of our nation's troubles. "I have no office to gain, said he, I want to preserve the Union, and the Union must be preserved." The South has been looking for such a case as this, to send her into the Constitution and the laws could be enforced. He proffered at some length in the same vein, and was vociferously applauded.

The Marshal, Mr. Johnson, then addressed the meeting, and read the law under which he was bound to act, and the public sentiment was so strong, that he was not only permitted to be upon the soil of Virginia, she could be purchased, and that he would contribute one hundred dollars toward the object.

Mr. Slade, Jr., one of this city, then offered some resolutions, the substance of which was, that however much the execution of the Fugitive Slave law may be repugnant to our feelings, yet the same having been decided by the highest judicial tribunal of our country to be constitutional, we will not do more than to resolve that we will not permit others to do it in our midst. These resolutions were received with warm approbation, and evidently echoed the sentiments of the meeting; but Judge Spaulding, moving in their stead, that the Marshal be requested to proceed to Wheeling to-morrow with the fugitive, accompanied by the smallest possible force, and that this meeting give him a unanimous assurance that he shall not be molested or interfered with, in the least; and, the Judge stating that he preferred his own resolution, those of Mr. Slade, the former were withdrawn by their mover, and that of Judge Spaulding adopted *unanimously*.

This morning the Marshal, with only two aids, took the fugitive to the depot, and left without molestation or disturbance.

This has ended this fugitive slave case on the Connecticut Western Reserve in Ohio—a case appealing strongly to our sympathies and occurring in the stronghold of Republicanism. It is a case which will be regarded as a submission to the laws is the first duty of a citizen in a free Government has prevailed over all. Henceforth let no man charge that Republicanism is synonymous with rebellion and revolution. Upon the altar of our country we have made this offering, and we trust that you will regard it with fear, for the Government has at no time had a title of the force here necessary to have retained this slave, had the Republicans determined to rescue her. I need hardly add that Judge Spaulding has been for many years regarded as a radical man in his views upon the question of slavery.

I have good reason for stating that Mr. Goshorn would never have pursued his slave had it not been for the urgent solicitation of the Union-loving citizens of Virginia, who desired to see the disunionists of that State arrested, and especially the Western Reserve of Ohio, is loyal to the Constitution and the laws. **BUCKEY.**

Judge Spaulding is a famous Republican, and so is Mr. Slade, Jr. Equally a son of the late Ex. Gov. Slade of Vermont who is supposed to be the writer of the above!

And so innocent female has been deliberately kidnapped by Republican politicians, and sent back into the brothel of slavery, on purpose to demonstrate to the slaveholders the loyalty of the Republicans of Ohio, "especially the Western Reserve!" What will the "Oberlin rescuers," who voted the Republican ticket say to this?

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

I deem it my duty to submit to Congress a series of resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Virginia on the 19th inst., having in view the peaceful settlement of the existing question of the rendition of the fugitive slave, and to refer to me on Thursday, the 24th inst., by Ex-President Tyler, who has left his dignified and honored retirement in the hope that he may render service to his country in this important period of our history. These resolutions, it will be perceived, extend an invitation to all States, whether slaveholding or non-slaveholding, as are willing to unite with Virginia in an earnest effort to adjust the present unhappy controversy in the spirit in which the Constitution was originally framed, and to consent to the appointment of commissioners to the people of the slaveholding States adequate security for their rights, to appoint commissioners to meet on the 4th day of February next, in the city of Washington, similar commissioners appointed by Virginia, to consider, and, if practicable, agree upon some basis of compromise. I confess, I hail this movement on the part of Virginia with great satisfaction. From the past history of this ancient and renowned commonwealth, we have the fullest assurance that what she undertakes she will accomplish, and it can be done, by able, enlightened and persevering efforts.





ALEXANDER HANNA, Congregational minister.  
JAMES DODS, Estab. Lib. of Scotland minister.  
P. H. THOMAS, of Abolition.  
ALEXANDER ERSKINE, merchant.  
GEORGE ROBIN, ex-Provost of Dundee.  
EDW. CAIRD, merchant.  
WILLIAM THOMAS, Justice of the Peace.  
PATRICK WATSON, merchant.

Extracts from the N. Y. Times Feb. 1.

*The President and Gen. Scott.*—There is no longer reason to doubt that a serious rupture has taken place between the President and Gen. Scott, or that the former, for a week past, has been nearly as vacillating and willful relative to the secession movement as he was before the discovery of Cobb, Floyd and Thompson's complicity in the disunion cabal.

Despite the protestation that no raids against the Capital are now contemplated, the General is very anxious on the subject, and feels that there is imminent necessity for a larger Federal force here, or that the former, for a week past, has been nearly as vacillating and willful relative to the secession movement as he was before the discovery of Cobb, Floyd and Thompson's complicity in the disunion cabal.

*The Defense of Washington.*—Gen. Scott thought at such a time, when the influence of a few leading men might throw the whole people of a State into a state of riot, it was judicious to provide at least for such contingency. There are now five hundred troops here, including marines; two additional companies are expected to night from Fort Hamilton.

*The conspiracy to assassinate Gen. Scott.*—I have been a war, for a fortnight past, that officers of the Government were in possession of information that a conspiracy was on foot looking to the assassination of Gen. Scott, and others; but whether evidence of the fact have been obtained, sufficient to warrant any action on the part of the officers of the law, has not yet transpired.

*Florida Moves.*—The Government construes favorably the failure to receive any news from Pensacola. The President now expresses the hope that a collision has been avoided. "There is reason to believe that strong efforts have been made by the secession leaders here to induce Major Chase, in command of the State troops at Pensacola, to precipitate a collision by attacking Fort Pickens, and thus bring Virginia and other border States. The instructions to the *Brooklyn* and *Mademoiselle* undoubtedly direct them to resist at every extremity any attempt of Florida troops to take the fort."

## Family Miscellany.

For the Principia.

FRANK.

AN ACROSTIC.

Far from there thee every sorrow,  
Kisses strew each hour my pillow;  
And thy kisses be ever clear;  
None for there more glad would sorrow  
Kind fate, than thy friend sincere,

E. J.

For the Principia.

A QUESTION.

Come, tell the wheel of life,  
Weave some strange web for thee,  
Caught in the tangled mesh, oh, thou most wise,  
Where will thy wisdom be?

E. J.

From The World We Live In.

A LESSON OF LIFE.

BY "VERONA."

While as snags were old man's locks,  
Quivering with age his chin;  
And the hand, with which he had tolled through life,  
Was wan, and worn, and thin.

Little Mary sat upon grandpa's knee,  
While he told her of the days gone by,  
Of the "Long Ago" of the days gone by,  
Of youth, though he now was old.

Mary listened, with looks intense,  
To grandpa's story of olden days,  
Till his breath was spent, and his story told,  
Then she told her begged for more.

Then he told her another, of equal length,  
Which the child with interest heard,  
Till, tired at length, she sweetly slept  
In his arms, like a wearied bird.

And I watched the child, and pondered long  
On the lameness of youth,  
And I wondered if innocence such as hers  
Would ever again snare but truth.

I saw her again, as time passed by,  
And the heart of childhood's years  
Was changed to that of the gay coquette  
Who laughed at old men's lore.

She was false as fair, no soul was there  
In that eye of heavenly blue,  
And I wept to see those who had their love  
At her feet and deemed her true.

Her gaze fell upon my eye,  
With the same old, ringing smile,  
And I had as true claim to her love,  
When it came, my heart to bind.

But I came not from that same old heart,  
Free from all worldly guile,  
And did I have, instead of that laugh,  
A sorrowful, longing smile.

I pondered, and I longed for a reason then,  
A lesson fraught with pain,  
That the golden truth was dreamed in youth,  
Nor springs to life again.

## STORY FOR THE LITTLE FOLKS.

CHAPTER VII.

Little Joseph's mother was dead, and he had grown upon her lovely features for the last time. Her sleeping dust had been conveyed to its silent resting place, and her spirit had returned to God who gave it. That was a sad and desolate home. No mother's arms were now extended to welcome her boy to her fond embrace. To whom, on earth, could he now turn for sympathy and protection, but his father, in whom, he found a loving, noble and manly heart, full of tenderness and care for his well-being.

Thus were the heart of father and son knit together by the tenderest ties. In process of time Joseph dreamed a dream, and told it his brethren, and they hated him.

And yet again he dreamed and told it his brethren, and they hated him more, but his father loved him, and made him coat of blue and red colors. But his older brethren went away to feed and take care of their father's flocks, lest the lambs should stray away and be lost, or the lion, bear or wolf should come and destroy them.

On a certain day the father said to Joseph, "go, I pray thee, and see whether it be well with thy brethren, and with the flocks, and bring me word again," and he departed to seek his brethren; and when they saw him afar off they said, "behold this dreamer cometh," and they conspired to kill him.

And when he drew near to them, they stripped him of his coat and cast him into a pit, and then sent down to eat. And as they lifted up their eyes, they saw a company of Ishmaelites from Gilead, going down into the land of Ham, and they drew up Joseph out of the pit and sold him unto them for about ten dollars, and they carried him down into Egypt and sold him unto Potiphar.

Dear children, what must have been the feelings of that father, as the evening shades drew on, and Joseph came not back. And as the darkness of night settled down upon them, how anxiously did he watch, and call and listen for tidings of his boy, but no tidings came.

Of what a long and fearful night to that father's heart, as he thought that his boy might be weeping in loneliness, or devoured by the wild beasts of the wood. And then how his heart was rent with anguish, when the older brethren came home, bringing Joseph's coat dipped in blood, to make his father think that he was torn in pieces by wild beasts. (Ah, cruel brothers, God saw your wickedness.)

And think of poor Joseph, far away from home, and friends and all the scenes he loved so well, a captive in bonds. In this case, Joseph's brethren were the kidnappers, the Ishmaelites the slave-traders, and Potiphar the slaveholder.

WILLIE. As Potiphar had paid his money for Joseph had he thereby got any right to hold him in bondage?

None at all, Willie, for Joseph's brethren had no right to steal and sell him to the Ishmaelites, and consequently could confer no right upon them to hold him in bonds; and they therefore could confer no right upon Potiphar to hold him as a slave.

MARY. Then Joseph had a right to escape whenever he had an opportunity, had he not?

Yes, and if any person had caught and sent him back to Potiphar, he would have been a kidnapper or slave-trader, and the bible teaches us that such persons shall surely be put to death.

WILLIE. Can any person lose his just title to his natural rights, except he forfeit them by his crimes?

No, never, for as God gave us our rights, He alone has the rightful authority to deprive us of them, and He never will do it wrongfully. Persons sometimes forfeit their rights by their crimes; for instance, a man sets fire to

his neighbor's house, and it is burned down by that wicked deed he forfeits his right to liberty, and may be shut up in prison; but even there, he is not to be abused.

Again, a person murders his neighbor—now by that fearful crime he forfeits his right to his own life, as you will see by reference to Gen. 9 ch. 6 verse.

Dear children, God gave you your rights as a sacred trust, guard them with care, and never lose them by doing wickedly.

NELLIE. Have the slaves in our own country just as good a right to their freedom as Joseph had?

Yes, for the slaves first brought here, were stolen, as he was, and had a perfect right to their freedom, and the same is true of every generation of slaves since, down to the present time.

CHARLIE. Then they all have a right to escape from slavery. Good, good?

Yes, and ought to do it, when they have the opportunity that they may learn their duties to each other, to their families, to their fellow men at large, and to their God.

MARY. Then it must be wicked to obey the fugitive slave bill, and send them back into slavery?

That is very true, and those who do it, are kidnappers and slave-traders. Now, dear children, remember these truths, and talk with your parents and friends about them.

Very Respectfully your,

DEACON T.

MAPLE COTTAGE, JAN. 24, 1861.

## EMPLOYMENT BETTER THAN SCOLDING.

Great unkindness and injustice is often done to little children, by treating them as mischievous, and scolding them for being troublesome, when the truth is, the little creatures are either weary for want of employment, or else the love of knowledge, or curiosity, has induced them to examine the inside of something they ought not to meddle with. Find them something to occupy them, and they will not trouble you with mischievousness. It has been said the mind of a child is as active as that of a statesman. This must be acknowledged, since it is admitted that a child learns more the first two years of his life than any six subsequent ones. And only think what the little creatures have to require. They have to learn a language—and one might almost say too, if we take into account the unintelligible jargon that some use when talking to infant children. Then they have to learn the use of every thing around them, and the various characters of persons they meet with. A father tells us while he was working in his garden, his little son was very anxious to help him, his hoe, shovel, and rake were each put in requisition, and, as might have been expected, he did more harm than good, and the father was under the necessity of arresting him several times, by saying, "Little boy, you need not do that; you must not do so." At length the little fellow said, "Well what may I do?"

Yes, And if three or four languages are spoken in the family, or boarding house, where a child is, it will learn all of them in four years. ED. PRINCIPIA.

## HOME LIFE.

Even as the sunbeam is composed of millions of minute rays, the home life is composed of little tendernesses, kindly looks, sweet laughter, gentle words, loving counsels; it must not be like the torch blaze of nature, exciting, which is easily quenched, but like the serene, chastened light which burns as safely in the dry east wind, as in the stillest atmosphere. Let each bear the other's burden the while—let each cultivate the mutual confidence, which is a gift capable of increase and improvement—and soon it will be found that kindness will spring up on every side, displacing constitutional unsuitability, want of mutual knowledge, even as we have seen sweet violets and primroses dispelling the gloom of the gray sea-rocks.

The Beech tree is said to be a non-conductor of lightning. So notorious is the fact that the Indians, whenever the sky wears the appearance of a thunder storm, leave their pursuits and take refuge under the nearest beech tree. In Tennessee the people consider it a complete protection. Dr. Deacon in a letter to Dr. Mitchell states that the Beech tree is never known to be struck by atmospheric electricity, while other trees are shattered into splinters. May not a knowledge of this afford protection to many, when exposed?

